

Community resources

[Follow us on Twitter](#) [Check our Reddit](#) [Twitter this](#) [Digg this page](#) [Contact us on IRC](#)

courage is contagious

Viewing cable 09USNATO546,

If you are new to these pages, please read an introduction on the [structure of a cable](#) as well as how to [discuss them](#) with others. See also the [FAQs](#)

Understanding cables

Every cable message consists of three parts:

- The top box shows each cable's unique reference number, when and by whom it originally was sent, and what its initial classification was.
- The middle box contains the header information that is associated with the cable. It includes information about the receiver(s) as well as a general subject.
- The bottom box presents the body of the cable. The opening can contain a more specific subject, references to other cables ([browse by origin](#) to find them) or additional comment. This is followed by the main contents of the cable: a summary, a collection of specific topics and a comment section.

To understand the justification used for the classification of each cable, please use this [WikiSource](#) article as reference.

Discussing cables

If you find meaningful or important information in a cable, please link directly to its unique reference number. Linking to a specific paragraph in the body of a cable is also possible by copying the appropriate link (to be found at the paragraph symbol). Please mark messages for social networking services like Twitter with the hash tags **#cablegate** and a hash containing the reference ID e.g. **#09USNATO546**.

Reference ID	Created	Released	Classification	Origin
09USNATO546	2009-11-23 13:23	2011-08-30 01:44	SECRET	Mission USNATO

Appears in these articles:

<http://www.aftenposten.no/spesial/wikileaksdokumenter/article4028273.ece>

VZCZCXRO5915
PP RUEHDBU RUEHSL
DE RUEHNO #0546/01 3271323
ZNY SSSSS ZZH
P 231323Z NOV 09
FM USMISSION USNATO
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3642
INFO RUCNCIS/CIS COLLECTIVE
RUEHND/MOSCOW POLITICAL COLLECTIVE
RUEHZG/NATO EU COLLECTIVE
RHMFISS/HQ USEUCOM VAHINGEN GE
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC
RHMFISS/USNMR SHAPE BE
RUEHNO/USDELMC BRUSSELS BE
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC
RHEFDIA/DIA WASHDC

S E C R E T SECTION 01 OF 03 USNATO 000546

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: DECL: 11/23/2019 TAGS: [PGOV](#) [PREL](#) [PINR](#) [MOPS](#) [NATO](#) [RS](#)

Classified By: Ambassador Daalder for reasons 1.4 (b/d).

- 1.** (S) Summary: NATO Allies expressed concern during a November 18 North Atlantic Council meeting over the message Russia intended to send by Largest Russian Exercises -----
- 2.** (S) On November 18, the NATO International Military Staff (IMS) briefed the North Atlantic Council (NAC) on the recent Russian military exercise -- Ladoga, held from August 10 to September 29, 2009, involved 15,000 Russian troops. Zapad was held from September 8-29, 2009, and involved 7, -- The Russians conducted this scenario as a series of exercises, possibly to keep the number of troops under the Vienna Documents legal threshold -- The exercises included offensive and defensive air operations, deployment of troops over long distances, joint operations with air forces, and -- The exercises demonstrated that Russia has limited capability for joint operations with air forces, continues to rely on aging and obsolete -- NATO IMS concluded that Russian armed forces were: able to respond to a small to mid-sized local and regional conflict in its western region Exercises are "Provocative and Inappropriate" -----
- 3.** (C) The SecGen characterized the exercises as "provocative and inappropriate" considering that NATO and Russia had committed to address the should not initiate a "downward spiral" in relations with Russia. Despite Allies raising with Russia their concern about the exercises, both in NATO Was Silent -----
- 4.** (C) NATO Allies from Central and Eastern Europe and Canada commented on what they saw as NATO's failure to respond adequately to the Russian -- Lithuania said that Russia disregarded the effects of the exercises on its neighbors, which were particularly sensitive to such provocations -- Poland complained that "NATO was silent" when the exercises took place, although it was satisfied that the NAC was now discussing this issue -- Latvia observed that even after several Allies had made their concern about the Russian exercises known, NATO failed to respond sufficiently -- Romania thought that the Russian actions had too close a resemblance to the Cold War era, and was part of a disturbing trend in Russian behavior -- The Czech Republic said it was "politically unacceptable" for a NATO Partner to demonstrate the behavior exhibited by Russia, which called it -- Estonia quoted from the NATO strategic intelligence document MC-161, which states that "Russia will continue to test the credibility and cohesion
- 5.** (C) The SecGen responded that "everything" could be discussed within the Alliance, but noted these Allies desire to discuss Russia more often Confidence Building a "Two Way Street" -----
- 6.** (C) Several Allies responded to Russian actions more cautiously, with Italy warning the Allies not to "over dramatize" the exercises. Italy
- 7.** (C) Ambassador Daalder called the lack of transparency demonstrated by a Partner country disturbing. He added that each nation had a right
- 8.** (C) Germany was tough on Russia, saying that it agreed with Allies that the scope and purpose of the exercises did not square with "where we relations." The NRC was the appropriate place to raise the Russian exercises, but this would allow Russia to raise concerns about NATO exercise Russian Actions Should Inform NATO Planning -----
- 9.** (C) Lithuania thought that the exercises suggested that Russia would continue planning for military action against "NATO territory," which Comment -----
- 10.** (C) Allies displayed a greater than usual degree of unity in this discussion of Russia, and from this we conclude that one of the greatest